arXiv:1606.03461v1 [math.CA] 10 Jun 2016

A DYADIC GEHRING INEQUALITY IN SPACES OF HOMOGENEOUS TYPE AND APPLICATIONS

THERESA C. ANDERSON AND DAVID E. WEIRICH

Abstract. We state a version of Gehring's self improvement Theorem for reverse Hölder weights which is valid for dyadic cubes over spaces of homogeneous type and explore some of the consequences. We give a proof based off a decaying stopping time argument.

1. Introduction

Gehring's Theorem is an example of a classical so-called "self-improvement" result in the theory of weights. We let w be a locally integrable function which is positive almost everywhere. For $1 < p < \infty$, we say that w belongs to the Reverse Hölder p class if there exists a constant C so that for all intervals $I = [a, b]$,

$$\left(\frac{1}{b-a}\int_a^b w(x)^p\,dx\right)^{1/p} \leq C\frac{1}{b-a}\int_a^b w(x)\,dx. \tag{1.1}$$

It is a trivial consequence of Hölder's inequality that if w satisfies (1.1) for some p, then it likewise satisfies (1.1) for any $1 < q < p$. Surprisingly though, one can show that there exists $\epsilon > 0$ so that w satisfies (1.1) for $p + \epsilon$ as well. This is the well known Gehring Theorem, first proved in [4], and we say it is a self improvement result because we have slightly improved the exponent.

Recent work has gone into proving an analogue to Gehring's Theorem in the more abstract setting of spaces of homogeneous type - quasi-metric spaces equipped with a doubling measure. In [9], Maasalo showed that the theorem is true in metric spaces with doubling measures provided the measure satisfies a radial decay property. Then in [1], Anderson, Hytönen, and Tapiola showed that the theorem is true for *weak* Reverse Hölder classes in general spaces of homogeneous type. What characterizes these classes as weak is that the domain of integration is enlarged on the right hand side of the inequality. One would hope that the "strong" result would soon follow, however in the same paper the authors constructed an explicit counterexample: a weight over a specific space which satisfies a inequality analogous to (1.1) for $p \leq p_0$ but not for $p > p_0$.

In [8], Katz and Pereyra used a decaying stopping time argument to prove Gehring's Theorem for weights over the real line. In the current paper we adapt this method to show that, in spite of the aforementioned counterexample, a *dyadic* version of the strong Gehring Theorem does indeed hold.

Theorem 1.1 (Dyadic Gehring's Theorem in Spaces of Homogeneous Type)**.** *Let $1 < p < \infty$ and w a weight over a space of homogeneous type. If $w \in RH_p^d$ then*

Date: June 14, 2016.

$w \in RH^d_{p+\epsilon}$ where RH^d_p denotes the class of weights which satisfy a dyadic reverse Hölder p inequality.

In Section 2 we give the necessary definitions and background. In Section 3 we state the main result of this paper, and give the idea of the stopping time. In Section 4 we give the proof and in Section 5 we explore some differences between the reverse Hölder classes in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and Spaces of Homogeneous Type and expand on the counterexample given in [1].

1.1. **Acknowledgments.** Theresa was supported by NSF DMS-1502464. David would like to thank Professors Eric Sawyer, David Cruz-Uribe, and Leonid Slavin for their helpful comments and suggestions during the 2015 AMS Spring Sectional Meeting at Michigan State University. Finally, David would also like to thank his advisor M. Cristina Pereyra for her constant support and encouragement.

2. Definitions

In this section we introduce the basic definitions used in this paper. Readers already familiar with these definitions may desire to skip to the next section.

2.1. **Spaces of Homogeneous Type.** Here we introduce the so-called spaces of homogeneous type, first defined by Coiffman and Weiss in [3].

Definition 2.1 (Quasi-metric space)**.** Let X be a set, and let $\rho : X \times X \to \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$ be a function which satisfies all the axioms of a metric except the triangle inequality. Instead, there exists a constant $\kappa_0 > 0$ such that for all $x, y, z \in X$,

$$\rho(x, y) \leq \kappa_0(\rho(x, z) + \rho(z, y)). \tag{2.1}$$

A function ρ satisfying 2.1 is called a *quasi-metric* and (X, ρ) is called a *quasi-metric space*.

As usual, we denote by $B(x, r) := \{y \in X : \rho(x, y) < r\}$ the open ball centred at $x \in X$ of radius $r > 0$ with respect to ρ.

Definition 2.2 (Geometrically Doubling)**.** Let (X, ρ) be a quasi-metric space. If there exists a constant $M \geq 1$ such that for any ball B of radius r, it is possible to cover B by no more than M balls of radius $r/2$, we say that (X, ρ) is *geometrically doubling.*

Definition 2.3 (Space of Homogeneous Type)**.** Let (X, ρ) be a quasi-metric space and let μ be a measure on X which satisfies that there exists a constant $\kappa_1 > 0$ such that for all balls $B(x, r) \subset X$,

$$\mu(B(x, 2r)) \leq \kappa_1 \cdot \mu(B(x, r)). \tag{2.2}$$

A measure satisfying (2.2) is said to be a *doubling measure* on X and the tuple (X, ρ, μ) is called a *space of homogeneous type*.

Remark 2.4. Remember, "geometric doubling" is a property of the metric, while "doubling" is a property of the measure. These two similar terms do not mean the same thing.

In this paper, we will refer to the constants κ_0 and κ_1 as *geometric constants*, as well as any other constant which depends only on them.

Lemma 2.5 (Spaces of Homogeneous Type are Geometrically Doubling)**.** *Let (X, ρ, μ) be a space of homogeneous type with μ a nontrivial measure, i.e. $\mu \not\equiv 0$ and $\mu \not\equiv \infty$. Then (X, ρ) is a geometrically doubling metric space and N is a geometric constant.*

This lemma is due to Coifman and Weiss ([3], pg. 68).

Remark 2.6. The converse of the above lemma is *not true*. In other words, one can equip a geometrically doubling quasi-metric space with a measure which is non-doubling. For example: $\mathbb{R}$ with the usual metric and the Gaussian probability measure.

For more on the basic properties of Spaces of Homogeneous type, see [6], [10], [3].

2.2. **Existence of Dyadic Cubes.** Of interest in this paper is the analogue to the traditional dyadic cubes we are familiar with in $\mathbb{R}^n$ that were first described by Christ in [2] (see also [11]). Here we recall the modern construction due to Hytönen and Kairema, found in [6]. Notice that this construction is *independent of measure*, i.e. it depends only on the properties of the quasi-metric. We paraphrase the main result of this paper below, omitting details which are not necessary for the result of the present paper.

Theorem 2.7 (Dyadic Cubes)**.** *Let (X, ρ) be a quasi-metric space which is geometrically doubling. Then there exists a system (or "lattice") of dyadic cubes $\mathcal{D} = \{Q_\alpha^k : k \in \mathbb{Z}, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k\}$ where $\mathcal{A}_k$ is an indexing set no larger than countably infinite. These cubes satisfy the following properties:*

1. *Cubes are organized into generations. For each $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ we can define the k^{th} generation $\mathcal{D}_k := \{Q_\alpha^k : \alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k\}$. Furthermore, each generation forms a partition of X, i.e.,*
$$X = \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_k} Q.$$
2. *Cubes are mutually nested. If $k \geq \ell$ then for any $Q \in \mathcal{D}_k$ and $Q' \in \mathcal{D}_\ell$, either $Q \subseteq Q'$ or $Q \cap Q' = \emptyset$. In the case where $Q \subseteq Q'$ we say that Q is a* descendant *of Q'.*
3. *Cubes are comparable to balls. There exist geometric constants $0 < r_0 \leq R_0 < \infty$ and $0 < \delta < 1$ so that for every $Q \in \mathcal{D}_k$ there is a point $z \in Q$ where*
$$B(z, r_0\delta^k) \subseteq Q \subseteq B(z, R_0\delta^k).$$

Remark 2.8. The dyadic lattice $\mathcal{D}$ may not be unique, and in general will not be (with the exception of contrived examples, such as $X = \{x_0\}$, a single point). Theorem 2.7 simply gives one such system of cubes. The proof is constructive, but it is sometimes useful in specific examples to bypass this construction when a more convenient one is readily available. For example, if $X = \mathbb{R}$ with the usual metric then the standard collection of dyadic intervals are a *dyadic structure*, even though the proof may have constructed a different collection.

It is a simple consequence of properties 1 - 3 of Theorem 2.7 that cubes, like balls, will satisfy a doubling property with respect to a doubling measure.

Corollary 2.9 (Parent Cubes)**.** *Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a dyadic lattice for (X, ρ) a geometrically doubling quasi-metric space. For every $Q \in \mathcal{D}_k$, there exists a unique cube $\widehat{Q} \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}$ so that $Q \subseteq \widehat{Q}$. We refer to $\widehat{Q}$ as Q's* parent*. Furthermore, if (X, ρ, μ) is a space of homogeneous type, there exists a geometric constant D so that*

$$\mu(\widehat{Q}) \leq D \cdot \mu(Q). \tag{2.3}$$

for all $Q \in \mathcal{D}$.

The proof of Corollary 2.9 follows from a straightforward application of the properties of dyadic cubes and of the doubling measure and can be found in the Appendix.

Remark 2.10. We will use the notation $\mathcal{D}(Q) := \{Q' \in \mathcal{D} : Q' \subseteq Q\}$ to refer to the set of all dyadic cubes which are descendants of Q.

2.3. **Weights.** We begin this section by recalling the definition of a weight.

Definition 2.11 (Weights)**.** Let (X, μ) be a measure space. A *weight* is a function $X \to \mathbb{R}$ which is locally μ-integrable, and positive almost everywhere with respect to the measure μ.

For a measurable set S and a measurable functions f (usually a weight) we will denote by $\langle f \rangle_S$ the mean of f over S, i.e.

$$\langle f \rangle_S := \frac{1}{\mu(S)} \int_S f(x)\, d\mu(x) \quad ; \quad \mu(S) \neq 0. \tag{2.4}$$

Finally, we state our last preliminary definition.

Definition 2.12 (Reverse Hölder Class)**.** Let (X, μ) be a measure space. Let $1 < p < \infty$, let w be a weight, and let $\mathcal{S}$ be a family of subsets of X. Suppose there exists a constant C such that for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$

$$\langle w^p \rangle_S^{1/p} \leq C \cdot \langle w \rangle_S. \tag{2.5}$$

Then we say that w belongs to the *reverse Hölder p* class with respect to $\mathcal{S}$, written $w \in RH_q(\mathcal{S})$ and we denote the smallest such C as $[w]_{RH_p(\mathcal{S})}$, called the *reverse Hölder p characteristic of w*. In particular, if ρ is a quasi-metric on X and $\mathcal{S}$ is the collection of all open balls, we say w belongs to the *continuous reverse Hölder p* class and write $w \in RH_p$. Moreover, if (X, ρ, μ) has a dyadic structure $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{D}$ then we say w belongs to the *dyadic reverse Hölder p* class and write $w \in RH_p^d$.

Notice that Definition 2.12 is meaningful whether μ is a doubling measure or not.

3. Main Result

In this section we give our main result and begin to build up the framework to support the proof.

3.1. **Gehring's Theorem.** The main theorem of this paper is that Gehring's Theorem holds in the dyadic setting for spaces of homogeneous type.

Theorem 3.1 (Main Result)**.** *Let (X, ρ, μ) be a space of homogeneous type with dyadic lattice $\mathcal{D}$. Let $1 < p < \infty$ and let $w \in RH_p^d$. Then there exists ϵ depending only on p, w, and geometric constants such that $w \in RH_{p+\epsilon}^d$.*

3.2. **Decaying Stopping Time.** The proof of 3.1, which can be found in Section 4, relies on a decaying stopping time argument. We introduce the idea here. Throughout this section (X, ρ, μ) is assumed to be a space of homogeneous type, with dyadic structure $\mathcal{D}$.

Let $\mathcal{P}$ denote some property about cubes, i.e., for any given cube the statement "Q has $\mathcal{P}$" is meaningful. This property may depend on any number of parameters including other cubes. For a fixed cube $Q \in \mathcal{D}$, we denote by $\mathcal{J}(Q) \subsetneq \mathcal{D}(Q)$ a collection of subcubes which are maximal with respect to $\mathcal{P}$. By maximality, we mean that if $Q' \subseteq Q$ has $\mathcal{P}$, then no descendant of Q' will be included in $\mathcal{J}(Q)$, regardless of whether it has $\mathcal{P}$ or not. Formally,

$$\mathcal{J}(Q) := \{Q' \in \mathcal{D}(Q) : Q' \text{ has } \mathcal{P} \text{ and } Q'' \text{ does not have } \mathcal{P}\ \forall Q'' \supsetneq Q'\}. \tag{3.1}$$

Primarily, for the purposes of stopping times, we are interested in properties which relate one cube to another.

Example 3.2. Let X be the real numbers with the usual metric and measure. For two cubes $Q, Q' \in \mathcal{D}$, suppose that Q' has $\mathcal{P}$ with respect to Q if and only if $Q' \subsetneq Q$. Then $[0, 2)$ has $\mathcal{P}$ with respect to $[0, 4)$.

Definition 3.3 (Admissible Property)**.** Suppose that $\mathcal{P}$ is a property about cubes with respect to another cube. Then we say $\mathcal{P}$ is *admissible* if for all $Q \in \mathcal{D}$, Q *does not* have $\mathcal{P}$ with respect to itself.

Remark 3.4. The property from Example 3.2 is admissible.

For an admissible property set $\mathcal{J}_0(Q) := \{Q\}$. We now define the collections $\mathcal{J}_n(Q)$ inductively. Let $n > 0$. Define

$$\mathcal{J}_n(Q) := \bigcup_{Q' \in \mathcal{J}_{n-1}(Q)} \mathcal{J}(Q').$$

The family of collections $\{\mathcal{J}_n(Q)\}_{n \geq 0}$ is called the *stopping time* $\mathcal{J}$ *for* Q.

Definition 3.5 (Decaying Stopping Time)**.** Let (X, ρ, μ) be a quasi-metric space equipped with a measure which has dyadic structure $\mathcal{D}$ and let $\mathcal{J}$ be a stopping time. We say that $\mathcal{J}$ is a *decaying stopping time* if and only if there exists $0 < c < 1$ such that for every $Q \in \mathcal{D}$,

$$\sum_{Q' \in \mathcal{J}_1(Q)} \mu(Q') \leq c\mu(Q). \tag{3.2}$$

Remark 3.6. Iterating 3.2 gives that

$$\sum_{Q' \in \mathcal{J}_n(Q)} \mu(Q') \leq c^n \mu(Q) \tag{3.3}$$

provided $\mathcal{J}$ is decaying.

Remark 3.7. The stopping time described in Example 3.2 is *not* decaying.

3.3. **The Stopping time $\mathcal{J}^w$.** Let us now describe a particular stopping time. Suppose that $w \in RH_p^d$ for some $1 < p < \infty$. If Q is a cube, we say that another cube $Q' \subset \mathcal{D}(Q)$ has property $\mathcal{P}^w$ with respect to Q if either $\langle w \rangle_{Q'} \geq \lambda \langle w \rangle_Q$ or $\langle w \rangle_{Q'} \leq \lambda^{-1} \langle w \rangle_Q$ where $\lambda > 1$ is a fixed parameter. While this property depends on a weight w, a parameter λ and a cube Q, we only write $\mathcal{P}^w$ (as opposed to, say, $\mathcal{P}_Q^{w,\lambda}$, in order to avoid over-cluttered notation.

Clearly the following lemma is true.

Lemma 3.8. *Property $\mathcal{P}^w$ is admissible.*

Proof. For any cube Q, since $\lambda > 1$, $\langle w \rangle_Q < \lambda \langle w \rangle_Q$ and $\langle w \rangle_Q > \lambda^{-1} \langle w \rangle_Q$. Thus no cube will ever have property $\mathcal{P}^w$ with respect to itself, which implies admissability. □

We define the stopping time $\mathcal{J}^w$ for Q as the stopping time generated by $\mathcal{P}^w$ with respect to Q.

3.4. **Helper Lemmas.** To prove Theorem 3.1 we show the following two helper lemmas:

Lemma 3.9. *If the stopping $\mathcal{J}^w$ described above is decaying then Theorem 3.1 holds.*

Lemma 3.10. *The stopping time $\mathcal{J}^w$ is decaying provided the parameter λ is chosen so large enough.*

It is thus sufficient to prove Lemmas 3.9 and 3.10. The following fact will be useful for both proofs.

Lemma 3.11. *Let $Q' \in \mathcal{J}^w(Q)$. Then $\langle w \rangle_{Q'} \leq D\lambda \langle w \rangle_Q$ where D is the geometric constant from Corollary 2.9.*

Proof. By the maximality condition for stopping times, since $Q' \in \mathcal{J}^w(Q)$, its parent $\widehat{Q'} \notin \mathcal{J}^w(Q)$. This means that $\lambda^{-1} \langle w \rangle_Q < \langle w \rangle_{\widehat{Q'}} < \lambda \langle w \rangle_Q$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle w \rangle_{Q'} &= \frac{1}{\mu(Q')} \int_{Q'} w \, d\mu \leq \frac{1}{\mu(Q')} \int_{\widehat{Q'}} w \, d\mu \\ &\leq \frac{D}{\mu(\widehat{Q'})} \int_{\widehat{Q'}} w \, d\mu = D \langle w \rangle_{\widehat{Q'}} < D\lambda \langle w \rangle_Q. \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 3.12. *Suppose $Q' \in \mathcal{J}_n^w(Q)$. Then $\langle w \rangle_{Q'} \leq (D\lambda)^n \langle w \rangle_Q$.*

Proof. Let $Q^0 := Q' \in \mathcal{J}_n^w(Q)$. By definition, there exists $Q^1 \in \mathcal{J}_{n-1}^w$ so that $Q^0 \in \mathcal{J}^w(Q^1)$. Continuing on in this fashion, for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ there exists $Q^i \in \mathcal{J}_{n-i}^w$ so that $Q^{i-1} \in \mathcal{J}^w(Q^i)$. With this notation, $Q^n = Q$. Iterating the result of Lemma 3.11 n times gives that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle w \rangle_{Q'} = \langle w \rangle_{Q^0} &\leq D\lambda \langle w \rangle_{Q^1} \leq (D\lambda)^2 \langle w \rangle_{Q^2} \\ &\leq \cdots \leq (D\lambda)^n \langle w \rangle_{Q^n} = (D\lambda)^n \langle w \rangle_Q. \end{aligned}$$

□

The following will also be useful.

Lemma 3.13. *For almost every $x \in X$ (with respect to the measure μ), $\lambda^{-1}\langle w\rangle_Q \leq w(x) \leq \lambda\langle w\rangle_Q$ for $x \notin \cup_{Q'\in\mathcal{J}^w(Q)}Q'$.*

Proof. Let $x \in Q$ such that $x \notin Q'$ for all $Q' \in \mathcal{J}^w(Q)$. Let k_0 be Q's generation, i.e. $Q \in \mathcal{D}^{k_0}$ and define Q_x^k as the cube belonging to generation $\mathcal{D}^k$ with $x \in Q_x^k$ for $k \geq k_0$. So $Q_x^k \notin \mathcal{J}^w(Q)$ for all $k \geq k_0$, thus by definition of property $\mathcal{P}^w$,

$$\lambda^{-1}\langle w\rangle_Q \leq \langle w\rangle_{Q_x^k} \leq \lambda\langle w\rangle_Q.$$

By the Lebesgue Differentiation Theorem, the limit as $k \to \infty$ of the center expression goes to $w(x)$ a.e. with respect to the measure μ. □

In the previous proof we used the Lebesgue Differentiation Theorem. This theorem was shown to be true dyadically in [5].

4. Proofs

In this section we present the proofs of Lemmas 3.9 and 3.10, thus establishing Theorem 3.1.

Proof of Lemma 3.9. Fix λ large, precisely how large to be determined later. For now it suffices to enforce that $\lambda > 3$. For a cube $Q \in \mathcal{D}$ let $\mathcal{J}^w$ be the stopping time for Q. Since the property $\mathcal{P}^w$ with respect to Q has two mutually exclusive stopping conditions, we can split $\mathcal{J}^w(Q)$ into two disjoint parts:

$$\mathcal{J}^w(Q) = \{Q' \in \mathcal{D}(Q) : \langle w\rangle_{Q'} \geq \lambda\langle w\rangle_Q\} \sqcup \{Q' \in \mathcal{D}(Q) : \langle w\rangle_{Q'} \leq \lambda^{-1}\langle w\rangle_Q\}$$

where by $\sqcup$ we mean the disjoint union, i.e., the union of two disjoint sets. We let $\{Q_i^\lambda\}_i$ be an enumeration of the subcubes in the first part and $\{Q_i^{1/\lambda}\}_i$ be an enumeration of the subcubes in the second part. We then write Q as the disjoint union of the three subsets

$$Q = B^\lambda \sqcup B^{1/\lambda} \sqcup G \tag{4.1}$$

with "bad parts" $B^\lambda := \cup_i Q_i^\lambda$ and $B^{1/\lambda} := \cup_i Q_i^{1/\lambda}$ (so called since the mean is either too large or too small on these parts) and "good part" $G := Q \setminus (B^\lambda \cup B^{1/\lambda})$. It follows from Lemma 3.13 that

$$\lambda^{-1}\langle w\rangle_Q \leq w(x) \leq \lambda\langle w\rangle_Q \quad \text{a.e. } x \in G.$$

Suppose that the desired lemma is false, that is, suppose that $\mathcal{J}^w$ is *not* decaying. This would imply that for each $0 < c < 1$ we can find a cube $Q \in \mathcal{D}$ such that

$$\sum_{Q'\in\mathcal{J}^w(Q)} \mu(Q') = \mu(Q \setminus G) > c \cdot \mu(Q)$$

implying that

$$(1-c) > \frac{\mu(G)}{\mu(Q)}.$$

In other words, the ratio of the measure of the good part to the measure of the whole cube can be made arbitrarily small.

Choose $Q \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\mu(G) \leq \mu(Q)/(3\lambda)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\int_G w\,d\mu &\leq \int_G \lambda\langle w\rangle_Q\,d\mu = \mu(G)\cdot\lambda\langle w\rangle_Q \\ &= \mu(G)\cdot\frac{\lambda}{\mu(Q)}\int_Q w\,d\mu \leq \frac{1}{3}\int_Q w\,d\mu \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

and

$$\int_{B^{1/\lambda}} w\,d\mu \le \mu(B^{1/\lambda})\cdot\lambda^{-1}\langle w\rangle_Q \le \lambda^{-1}\frac{\mu(B^{1/\lambda})}{\mu(Q)}\int_Q w\,d\mu$$

$$\le \lambda^{-1}\int_Q w\,d\mu < \frac{1}{3}\int_Q w\,d\mu. \tag{4.3}$$

Inequalities (4.2) and (4.3) together imply that

$$\int_{B^\lambda} w\,d\mu = \int_{Q\setminus(G\cup B^{1/\lambda})} w\,d\mu = \int_Q w\,d\mu - \int_G w\,d\mu - \int_{B^{1/\lambda}} w\,d\mu$$

$$> \int_Q w\,d\mu - \frac{1}{3}\int_Q w\,d\mu - \frac{1}{3}\int_Q w\,d\mu = \frac{1}{3}\int_Q w\,d\mu. \tag{4.4}$$

We can also see that

$$\langle w\rangle_{B^\lambda} = \frac{1}{\mu(B^\lambda)}\sum_i \int_{Q_i^\lambda} w\,d\mu = \frac{1}{\mu(B^\lambda)}\sum_i \mu(Q_i^\lambda)\langle w\rangle_{Q_i^\lambda}$$

$$\le \frac{1}{\mu(B^\lambda)}\sum_i \mu(Q_i^\lambda)D\lambda\langle w\rangle_Q = D\lambda\langle w\rangle_Q \tag{4.5}$$

where in (4.5) we used Lemma 3.11. We use (4.5) and (4.4) to get a lower bound on the measure of B^λ:

$$\mu(B^\lambda) = \frac{1}{\langle w\rangle_{B^\lambda}}\int_{B^\lambda} w\,d\mu \ge \frac{1}{3\langle w\rangle_{B^\lambda}}\int_Q w\,d\mu$$

$$\ge \frac{1}{3D\langle w\rangle_Q}\int_Q w\,d\mu = \frac{1}{3D\lambda}\mu(Q) \tag{4.6}$$

We will now use this lower bound to establish a contradiction. Observe that

$$\int_Q w^p\,d\mu \ge \int_{B^\lambda} w^p\,d\mu = \sum_i \int_{Q_i^\lambda} w^p\,d\mu$$

$$\ge \sum_i \frac{1}{\mu(Q_i^\lambda)^{p-1}}\left(\int_{Q_i^\lambda} w\,d\mu\right)^p \tag{4.7}$$

$$= \sum_i \mu(Q_i^\lambda)\langle w\rangle_{Q_i^\lambda}^p \ge \lambda^p\sum_i \mu(Q_i^\lambda)\langle w\rangle_Q^p \tag{4.8}$$

$$= \lambda^p\mu(B^\lambda)\langle w\rangle_Q^p \ge \frac{1}{3D}\lambda^{p-1}\mu(Q)\langle w\rangle_Q^p \tag{4.9}$$

where in (4.7) follows from the Hölder inequality, (4.8) by the definition of B^λ, and (4.9) from (4.6). Dividing both sides by $\mu(Q)$ and taking the $1/p$ power gives that

$$\langle w^p\rangle_Q^{1/p} \ge \left(\frac{1}{3D}\lambda^{p-1}\right)^{1/p}\langle w\rangle_Q. \tag{4.10}$$

We thus contradict that $w \in RH_p^d$, provided that λ is chosen large enough so that $\lambda > (3D[w]^p_{RH_p^d})^{1/(p-1)}$. □

Remark 4.1. The preceding proof was a proof by contradiction. While we demonstrated that the decaying constant c does exists, we have no guarantee on the size of this constant.

Proof of Lemma 3.10. Let $Q \in \mathcal{D}$ be any cube. We define the n^{th} "good" and "bad" sets as

$$B_n(Q) := \bigcup_{Q' \in \mathcal{J}_n^w(Q)} Q' \ ; \quad n \geq 0,$$
$$G_n(Q) := B_{n-1}(Q) \setminus B_n(Q) \ ; \quad n > 0.$$

Notice that $B_0(Q) = Q = \sqcup_n G_n(Q)$. By the Lemma 3.9, we can choose $\lambda > 1$ sufficiently large to ensure that $\mathcal{J}^w$ is decaying. So there exists $0 < c < 1$ so that

$$\mu(B_n(Q)) \leq c^n \mu(Q) \ \ ; \ \ \forall Q \in \mathcal{D}.$$

Our first goal will be to establish that

$$\int_{G_n(Q)} w^p \, d\mu \leq a^{n-1} \int_Q w^p \, d\mu \tag{4.11}$$

for a constant $0 < a < 1$ depending only on p, c, $[w]_{RH_p^d}$, and geometric constants. First, we consider some properties of $G_1(Q)$. We know by Lemma 3.13 that

$$\lambda^{-1} \langle w \rangle_Q \leq w(x) \quad \text{a.e. } x \in G_1(Q),$$

and that

$$\mu(G_1(Q)) \geq (1-c)\mu(Q).$$

Using these two facts, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{G_1(Q)} w^p \, d\mu &\geq \int_{G_1(Q)} \frac{1}{\lambda^p} \langle w \rangle_Q^p \, d\mu = \frac{\mu(G_1(Q))}{\lambda^p} \langle w \rangle_Q^p \\ &\geq \frac{(1-c)\mu(Q)}{\lambda^p} \langle w \rangle_Q^p \geq \frac{(1-c)\mu(Q)}{\lambda^p [w]_{RH_p^d}} \langle w^p \rangle_Q \\ &= \frac{(1-c)}{\lambda^p [w]_{RH_p^d}} \int_Q w^p \, d\mu \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

Notice that the domain of integration for the far right hand side of inequality (4.12) is a subset of the domain of integration of the far left hand side. In fact, $\mu(G_1(Q)) < \mu(Q)$. Set

$$(1-a) := \frac{(1-c)}{\lambda^p [w]_{RH_p^d}} \in (0,1).$$

We observe that this constant a depends only on p, c, $[w]_{RH_p^d}$, and geometric constants. In particular, we observe that a is independent of Q. We now extrapolate this result. We observe (in order to abuse) that

$$G_n(Q) = \bigsqcup_{Q' \in \mathcal{J}_{n-1}^w(Q)} G_1(Q').$$

This allows us to easily see that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{G_n(Q)} w^p\,d\mu &= \sum_{Q'\in\mathcal{J}^w_{n-1}(Q)}\int_{G_1(Q')} w^p\,d\mu\\ &\geq \sum_{Q'\in\mathcal{J}^w_{n-1}(Q)}(1-a)\int_{Q'} w^p\,d\mu\\ &= (1-a)\int_{B_{n-1}(Q)} w^p\,d\mu.\end{aligned}$$

With this, we now have that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_n(Q)} w^p\,d\mu &= \int_{B_{n-1}(Q)} w^p\,d\mu - \int_{G_n(Q)} w^p\,d\mu\\ &\leq \int_{B_{n-1}(Q)} w^p\,d\mu - (1-a)\int_{B_{n-1}(Q)} w^p\,d\mu\\ &= a\int_{B_{n-1}(Q)} w^p\,d\mu. \qquad (4.13)\end{aligned}$$

Since $G_n(Q)\subseteq B_{n-1}(Q)$, iterating (4.13) $n-1$ times gives (4.11).

Fix $\epsilon>0$ (determined later). Using what was shown above,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_Q w^{p+\epsilon}\,d\mu &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\int_{G_n(Q)} w^{p+\epsilon}\,d\mu\\ &\leq \langle w\rangle_Q^{\epsilon}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(D\lambda)^{n\epsilon}\int_{G_n(Q)} w^p\,d\mu \qquad (4.14)\\ &\leq \langle w\rangle_Q^{\epsilon}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(D\lambda)^{n\epsilon}a^{n-1}\int_{Q} w^p\,d\mu \qquad (4.15)\end{aligned}$$

where in line (4.14) we used Corollary 3.12. From here, we choose ϵ small enough so that $(D\lambda)^{\epsilon}<a^{-1}$, which is possible since $0<a<1$. Then the sum

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(D\lambda)^{n\epsilon}a^{n-1} =: A<\infty.$$

Therefore, dividing both sides by $\mu(Q)$ gives that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle w^{p+\epsilon}\rangle_Q &\leq A\langle w\rangle_Q^{\epsilon}\langle w^p\rangle_Q\\ &\leq A[w]^p_{RH^d_p}\langle w\rangle_Q^{p+\epsilon}.\end{aligned}$$

Since the constant A depended only on p, w, and geometric constants we can conclude that $w\in RH^d_{p+\epsilon}$. □

Remark 4.2. By examining the constants in the proof, we can actually see that $\epsilon<\frac{1}{[w]_{RH^d_{p+\epsilon}}-1}$.

It is worth noting that the only time the doubling condition on the weight μ was used was in Lemma 3.11. With this in mind we can state the following corollary.

Corollary 4.3. *Let (X,ρ,μ) be a quasi-metric measure space with μ a measure which may or may not be doubling and some dyadic structure $\mathcal{D}$. Let $1<p<\infty$*

and let $w \in RH_p^d$ be a weight such that there exists constants $C_1 > D$ so that for all cubes $Q \in \mathcal{D}$:

$$\langle w \rangle_Q \leq C_1 \langle w \rangle_{\widehat{Q}} \tag{4.16}$$

Then there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $w \in RH_{p+\epsilon}^d$. (Recall $\widehat{Q}$ denotes the unique parent cube of Q.)

Remark 4.4. It is easy to confuse a doubling weight with a doubling measure. However, these are not the same thing. there exist weights which are not doubling over measures which are, and non-doubling measures can support doubling weights. In light of this, it is important to take care when using this terminology.

5. Applications

We have shown that in any space of homogeneous type a dyadic strong Gehring does hold, but from the counterexample in [1], a strong continuous Gehring using the metric balls does not hold. It turns out that the key property that this counterexample lacks is doubling of the measure w. Recall that the weight w is doubling if

$$w(2B) \leq Cw(B)$$

for all balls, and that w is dyadic doubling if

$$w(\hat{Q}) \leq Cw(Q)$$

for all cubes $Q \in \mathcal{D}$. We use the notation Db to indicate the class of doubling weights.

In [7], the authors prove that

$$RH_p \cap Db = \bigcap_{j=1}^{J_0} \left(RH_p(\mathcal{D}^{(j)}) \cap Db(\mathcal{D}^{(j)}) \right). \tag{5.1}$$

where they use J_0 distinct dyadic systems in an SHT. In other words, for doubling weights, the continuous reverse Hölder class is equal to the intersection of finitely many dyadic reverse Hölder classes that are also dyadic doubling. In $\mathbb{R}^n$ note that RH_p implies doubling (continuous), but dyadic RH_p does not necessarily imply dyadic doubling. This is no longer true in an SHT. Even though we have shown that dyadic Gehring does hold in any SHT, this does not imply that continuous Gehring does.

The counterexample to strong continuous Gehring in [1] is in fact not doubling. Since the counterexample is RH_p for certain values of p, we must no longer have that RH_p implies doubling, as is true in $\mathbb{R}^n$. This is an important distinction between $\mathbb{R}^n$ and SHT.

We will now show directly that the counterexample is not doubling. We briefly recall the details below but refer the reader to [1] as well.

Theorem 5.1. *The counterexample in* [1] *is not doubling. Explicitly, we show that there exists a sequence of balls B_j such that $w(2B_j) \geq 4$ for all j but that $w(B_j) \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$.*

Proof. We first recall some details from the counterexample. Define a metric space (X, d) as follows. Take $\mathbb{R}^2$ with the l^∞ metric so the balls are actually squares. Let our space X be the "haircomb space" defined as $X = A \cup \bigcup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} W_j$ with

$$A = \{(u, 0) : u \in \mathbb{R}\}, \quad U = \{(u, \frac{1}{2}u) : u \in (0, 1]\}, \quad V = \{(1, v) : v \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]\},$$

and $W_j := U \cup V + (10j, 0) = U_j \cup V_j$.



FIGURE 1. The haircomb counterexample. Above: Zoomed in. Below: Zoomed out to show repetition.

We use the l^∞ metric and the arc-length measure. The weight f_h is defined as

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x \in A \\ \varepsilon_j, & \text{if } x \in V_j \\ \min\{1, \varepsilon_j g(u)\}, & \text{if } x = (10j + u, \frac{1}{2}u) \in U_j \end{cases}.$$

where $\varepsilon_j \to 0^+$, $\varepsilon_j \leq 1$, $h(t) := t^{-\alpha} \log^{-1}(e/t)$ for some $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $g(t) = \max\{h(t), 1\}$. Note $f_h \leq 1$ everywhere.

Recall that the authors of [1] showed that this weight was in RH_p if and only if $p \leq 1/\alpha$, which implies the failure of the strong Gehring inequality.

Now we construct the sequence of balls B_j. The idea is to have B_j pick up mass only on one of the comb teeth, but to have $2B_j$ pick up a sizable mass of the line A which is more heavily weighted. Since the measure of the comb teeth depends on ϵ_j which heads to 0, the measure of each subsequent B_j will decrease. Let B_j be the ball centered at $(10j + 1, 1/2)$ with radius $1/2$. Now

$$f_h(2B_j) = \int_{2B_j} f_h(x)d\mu = \int_{A\cap B_j} f_h(x)dx + \int_{U_j} f_h(x)du + \int_{V_j} f_h(x)dv$$
$$\geq 4 + \epsilon_j \cdot 1/2 \geq 4.$$

Finally, we show that $f_h(B_j) \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$.

$$f_h(B_j) = \int_{B_j} f_h(x)d\mu = \int_{U_j\cap B_j} f_h(x)du + \int_{V_j} f_h(x)dv$$

$$\leq \int_{U_j \cap B_j} \sup h(u), 1 du + \epsilon_j \cdot 1/2 \leq C_\alpha \epsilon_j$$

since $h(u)$ is integrable ($h \in L^1[0,1]$), so the integral over U_j is bounded by a constant C_α. Since ϵ_j is chosen such that $1 \geq \epsilon_j \geq 0, \epsilon_j \to 0$, we have that $f_h(B_j) \to 0$.

Therefore, f_h is not a doubling weight. □

We do however, have the following.

Corollary 5.2 ("Almost Strong" Continuous Gehring for Spaces of Homogeneous Type)**.** *Let w be a continuous doubling weight so that $w \in RH_p$. There exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $w \in RH_{p+\epsilon}$.*

Proof. The proof is trivial. Assume that w is continuous doubling and in RH_p. Then $w \in RH_p(\mathcal{D}^{(j)}) \cap Db(\mathcal{D}^{(j)}$ for each $j = 1, ..., J_0$. By Corollary 4.3, for each j there exists $\epsilon_j > 0$ such that $w \in RH_{p+\epsilon_j}(\mathcal{D}^{(j)})$. Set $\epsilon := \min\{e_j : 1 \leq j \leq J_0\} > 0$. Then $w \in RH_{p+\epsilon}(\mathcal{D}^{(j)}) \cap Db(\mathcal{D}^{(j)})$ for all j, which is a subset of $RH_{p+\epsilon}$. □

6. Appendix

For interested readers we give the proof of Corollary 2.9.

Lemma 6.1 (Doubling for General Radii)**.** *Let (X, ρ, μ) be a space of homogeneous type. If $x \in X$ and $R > r > 0$ then*

$$\mu(B(x,R)) \leq \kappa_1^{\log_2 \lceil R/r \rceil} \cdot \mu(B(x,r)), \tag{6.1}$$

Proof. By the doubling property,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu((B(x,R)) &\leq \kappa_1 \cdot \mu(B(x,R/2)) \\ &\leq \kappa_1^2 \cdot \mu(B(x,R/4)) \\ &\leq \cdots \\ &\leq \kappa_1^n \cdot \mu(B(x, R \cdot 2^{-n})) \end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

Choose n so that $r/2 \leq R2^{-n} < r$. □

Lemma 6.2 (Distant Balls Lemma)**.** *Let $x, y \in X$ and set $R := \rho(x,y)$. Then for all $r > 0$,*

$$\mu(B(y,r)) \leq \kappa_1^{\log_2\left(\frac{\kappa_0(R+r)}{r}\right)} \cdot \mu(B(x,r)). \tag{6.3}$$

Proof. Let $x, y \in X$ and $r > 0$. Set $R = \rho(x,y)$. We wish to cover the ball $B(y,r)$ with a ball centered at x. To do this, the radius $\kappa_0(R+r)$ suffices. To see this, suppose that $z \in B(y,r)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(x,z) &\leq \kappa_0(\rho(x,y) + \rho(y,z)) \\ &= \kappa_0(R+r) \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $z \in B(x, \kappa_0(R+r))$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} B(y,r) &\subseteq B(x, \kappa_0(R+r)) \\ \mu(B(y,r)) &\leq \mu(B(x, \kappa_0(R+r)) \\ &\leq \kappa_1^{\log_2\left(\frac{\kappa_0(R+r)}{r}\right)} \cdot \mu(B(x,r)) \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from Lemma 6.1. □

Proof of Corollary 2.9. Let $Q \in \mathcal{D}_k$ be a cube, with parent cube $\widehat{Q} \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}$ Then there exists balls $B_1 := B(z_1, r_0\delta^k) \subseteq Q$ and $B_2 = B(z_2, R_0\delta^{k-1}) \supseteq \widehat{Q}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu(\widehat{Q}) &\leq \mu(B_2) \\
&\leq \kappa_1^{\log_2\lceil R_0/(r_0\delta)\rceil} \cdot \mu(B(z_2, r_0\delta^k)) \tag{6.4}\\
&\leq \kappa_1^{\log_2\left(\frac{\kappa_0(R_0\delta^{k-1}+r_0\delta^k)}{r_0\delta^k}\right)} \cdot \kappa_1^{\log_2\lceil R_0/(r_0\delta)\rceil} \cdot \mu(B_1) \tag{6.5}\\
&\leq \kappa_1^{\log_2\left(\frac{\kappa_0(R_0\delta^{k-1}+r_0\delta^k)}{r_0\delta^k}\right)} \cdot \kappa_1^{\log_2\lceil R_0/(r_0\delta)\rceil} \cdot \mu(Q) \tag{6.6}
\end{aligned}$$

where (6.5) follows from the Distant Balls Lemma, and (6.4) follows from doubling for general radii. □

References

1. T. Anderson, T. Hytönen, and O. Tapiola, *Weak A_∞ weights and weak reverse Hölder property in space of homogeneous type*, 2014.
2. M. Christ, *A $T(b)$ theorem with remarks on analytic capacity and the Cauchy integral*, Colloq. Math. **60/61** (1900), 601–628.
3. R. Coifman and G. Weiss, *Analyse harmonique non-commutative sur certains espaces homogenes*, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1971.
4. F. W. Gehring, *The L^p integrbility of partial derivatives of a quasiconformal mapping*, Acta. Math. **130** (1973), 265–277.
5. T. Hytönen, *Martingales in harmonic analysis*, 2008.
6. T. Hytönen and A. Kairema, *Systems of dyadic cubes in a doubling metric space*, Colloq. Math. **126** (2012), 1–33.
7. A. Kairema, J. Li, M. C. Pereyra, and L. A. Ward, *Haar basis on quasi-metric measure spaces, and dyadic shift structure theorems for function spaces on product spaces of homogeneous type*, Journal of Functional Analysis, 2016.
8. N. H. Katz and M. C. Pereyra, *Haar multipliers, paraproducts, and weighted inequalities*, Analysis of Divergence (1999), 145–170.
9. O. E. Maasalo, *The Gehring lemma in metric space*, 2006.
10. R. A. Macías and C. Segovia, *Lipschitz functions on spaces of homogeneous type*, Avd. in Math **33** (1979), 257–270.
11. E. Sawyer and R. L. Wheeden, *Weighted inequalities for fractional integrals on Euclidean and homogeneous spaces*, Amer. J. of Math. **114** (1992), 813–874.

The University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, 53703
E-mail address: tcanderson@math.wisd.edu

1 University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM, 87131
E-mail address: dweirich@unm.edu